



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/069,944 | 09/19/2002 | David William Dew | P.19470/MARJR | 3027 |

7590

07/21/2006

Jennifer P Yancy
Jones Tullar & Cooper
Eads Station
PO Box 2266
Arlington, VA 22202

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

WILKINS III, HARRY D

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1742

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/069,944 | DEW ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Harry D. Wilkins, III | 1742 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36 and 38-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36 and 38-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status

1. The rejection of claims 44-46 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph has been withdrawn in view of the deletion of the requirement in claim 44 of "at a temperature of up to 45°C".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 36 and 38-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmett, Jr et al (US 5,007,620) in view of Brierley (US 5,332,559), McWhirter et al (US 6,299,776), Eppstein et al (US 4,680,267), and Vahldieck (US 3,926,794).

Emmett, Jr et al teach (see abstract) a method of bioleaching a metal from a metal bearing sulfide mineral slurry, including the steps of subjecting the slurry in a reactor to a bioleaching process, supplying a feed gas containing oxygen (air, see fig. 22, which contains 21% oxygen), and recovering metal from the bioleach residue (see col. 1, lines 38-60).

Thus, Emmett, Jr. et al do not teach (1) using thermophilic bacteria for temperatures over 45°C, (2) the step of controlling the dissolved oxygen concentration in the slurry to a desired level by controlling at least one of the oxygen content of the

feed gas, the supply of feed gas or the rate of feed of slurry or (3) the feed gas containing oxygen contains at least 85% oxygen.

Emmett, Jr. et al teach the mesophilic bacteria were preferred, but do not exclude the use of thermophilic bacteria.

Brierley et al teach (see abstract and col. 21, line 60 to col. 22, line 13) using various different bacterial microorganisms for the decomposition of metal sulfide ores. Brierley et al teach using thermophilic bacteria (used at temperatures above 50°C) *Sulfobacillus thermosulfidooxidans* or *Sulfolobus acidocaldarius* species of bacterium.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted the thermophilic microorganisms of Brierley et al for the mesophilic microorganisms of Emmett, Jr. et al because the thermophilic bacteria have the advantage of being more heat resistant to withstand the exothermic bioleach process (see paragraph spanning cols. 22 and 23).

McWhirter et al teach (see col. 1, line 26 to col. 2, line 19) that the dissolved oxygen concentration in bioleaching (biochemical oxidation) controls the rate at which sulfides were oxidized to sulfates by microorganisms. Thus, the dissolved oxygen concentration was recognized in the prior art as a result effective variable.

Eppstein et al teach (see abstract) control means for adjusting the dissolved oxygen concentration in a bioreactor, which is measured by an oxygen sensor, that controls the oxygen content of the feed gas.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have added the controlling step of Eppstein et al to the method of Emmett, Jr et al because

Art Unit: 1742

McWhirter et al teach that dissolved oxygen controls the rate of the reaction and the controlling step of Eppstein et al can control the dissolved oxygen level in a bioreactor to a desired high amount to facilitate the reaction.

Vahldieck teaches (see col. 1, line 9 to col. 4, line 29) that in aerobic thermophilic biological oxidation reactions, difficulty arose in achieving sufficient dissolved oxygen concentration due to lowered Henry's Law constant and reduced partial pressure of oxygen in the gas phase (both of which equate to lowered effective oxygen concentration in Applicant's formula (1)). Vahldieck suggests using high concentration oxygen gas, such as pure oxygen to increase the mass transfer rate of oxygen into the high temperature slurry.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used pure oxygen, or at least enhanced concentration oxygen (at least 85%), as the feed gas in the process of Emmett, Jr. et al and Brierley et al because Vahldieck teach that increasing the oxygen concentration improves the rate of oxygen dissolution.

Regarding the actual concentration of dissolved oxygen in the slurry, it would have been within the expected skill of a routineer in the art to have optimized the concentration of oxygen in the slurry in order to maximize the reaction rate. Emmett, Jr. et al describe (see figs. 24 and 28) oxygen concentrations ranging from 1 to 4 mg/L (1.0×10^{-3} kg/m³ to 4.0×10^{-3} kg/m³). Brierley et al teach (see col. 24, lines 21-24) using a dissolved oxygen concentration of 0.5-2 mg/L. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have controlled the dissolved oxygen concentration to a comparable value.

Art Unit: 1742

Regarding claim 38, Eppstein et al measure (see col. 3, lines 40-47) the dissolved oxygen concentration by directly measuring dissolved oxygen concentration inside the bioreactor.

Regarding claims 39 and 40, Emmett, Jr. et al teach (see col. 21, lines 1-9) controlling the CO₂ content of the slurry. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have also controlled the amount of carbon dioxide in the slurry by means similar to the oxygen control of Eppstein et al.

Regarding claim 41, Emmett, Jr et al teach (see col. 21, lines 1-9) feeding and controlling CO₂ to the bioleaching reactor. It would have been within the expected skill of a routineer in the art to have found the optimum amount of carbon dioxide in the feed gas for producing the best bioleaching results.

Regarding claims 42, 43 and 47-52, Brierley et al teach (see abstract and col. 21, line 60 to col. 22, line 13) using various different bacterial microorganisms for the decomposition of metal sulfide ores. Brierley et al teach using *Sulfobacillus thermosulfidooxidans* or *Sulfolobus acidocaldarius* species of bacterium. These bacteria were utilized at thermophilic temperatures, i.e.-above 55°C.

Regarding claims 44-46, Emmett, Jr. et al teach using mesophilic microorganisms such as *Thiobacillus ferrooxidans*.

Regarding claim 53, the reactor of Emmett, Jr et al is substantially closed (see figures 1 and 3, particularly the lid shown in figure 3).

Regarding claim 54, Emmett, Jr. et al teach (see fig. 22) a plant for recovering zinc that includes a reactor vessel (232), a source which feeds the slurry to the vessel,

Art Unit: 1742

an oxygen source (air compressor) supplying gas to the slurry, and a recovery system to recover zinc from the bioleach residue. Thus, Emmett, Jr. et al fail to teach the device that measures the dissolved oxygen concentration and the control mechanism.

McWhirter et al teach (see col. 1, line 26 to col. 2, line 19) that the dissolved oxygen concentration in bioleaching (biochemical oxidation) controls the rate at which sulfides were oxidized to sulfates by microorganisms.

Eppstein et al teach (see abstract) control means for adjusting the dissolved oxygen concentration in a bioreactor, which is measured by an oxygen sensor, that controls the oxygen content of the feed gas.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have added the oxygen sensor and control means of Eppstein et al to the plant of Emmett, Jr et al because McWhirter et al teach that dissolved oxygen controls the rate of the reaction and the oxygen sensor and control means of Eppstein et al can control the dissolved oxygen level in a bioreactor to a desired high amount to facilitate the reaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have fed pure oxygen gas to the reactor as taught by Whellock et al (see above) in order to improve the reaction rate of the bioleaching process.

Regarding claim 55, regarding the limitations that the reactor vessel is operated at temperature in excess of 60°C, the above limitations are not further limiting on the apparatus claim because the above limitation deals with the manner or method of use of the claimed apparatus. It has been well settled that the manner or method of use of an apparatus cannot be relied upon to further limit claims to the apparatus itself. See In re

Art Unit: 1742

Casey, 152 USPQ 235, and MPEP 2114. However, even if the limitation were given patentable weight, Brierley et al suggest using thermophilic bacteria at temperatures exceeding 55°C.

Double Patenting

4. Claims 36 and 38-55 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 50, 67-81 of copending Application No. 10/090,945. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each and every limitation of the present claims is included in the claims of the '945 Application. Regarding present claim 38, it would have been considered obvious to have determined the dissolved oxygen concentration by directly measuring it so that it could be controlled. Regarding present claim 53, it would have been considered obvious to have performed the bioleaching process in a closed reactor to prevent contamination.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claims 36 and 38-55 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 11-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,733,567. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each and every limitation of the present claims is included in the claims of the '567 Patent. Regarding present claim 38, it would have been considered obvious to have determined the dissolved oxygen concentration by directly measuring it so that it could be controlled. Regarding present claim 53, it

Art Unit: 1742

would have been considered obvious to have performed the bioleaching process in a closed reactor to prevent contamination.

6. Claims 36 and 38-55 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,833,020. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each and every limitation of the present claims is included in the claims of the '020 Patent. Regarding present claim 38, it would have been considered obvious to have determined the dissolved oxygen concentration by directly measuring it so that it could be controlled. Regarding present claim 53, it would have been considered obvious to have performed the bioleaching process in a closed reactor to prevent contamination.

7. Claims 36 and 38-55 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 11-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,860,919. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each and every limitation of the present claims is included in the claims of the '919 Patent. Regarding present claim 38, it would have been considered obvious to have determined the dissolved oxygen concentration by directly measuring it so that it could be controlled. Regarding present claim 53, it would have been considered obvious to have performed the bioleaching process in a closed reactor to prevent contamination.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 31 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has argued that:

- a. The Examiner has failed to provide a motivation for the combination of the references.

In response, the Examiner set forth explicit reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have made the combination of references. These can be seen in the above rejection grounds.

- b. The disclosure of Vahldieck is not combinable with the other references since the microorganism of Vahldieck is completely different from the microorganisms of the sulfide ore bioleaching-type.

In response, although Vahldieck is directed to using different microorganisms, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the teachings of Vahldieck to be quite pertinent when addressed with the problem of maintaining sufficient dissolved oxygen concentrations at temperatures above 45°C. Vahldieck disclose that at elevated temperatures, due to a combination of Henry's law and the reduced partial pressure of oxygen, the rate of oxygen uptake into a slurry became lowered. This teaching would have applied to any slurry, not just any specific slurry. Vahldieck teach that in order to overcome the difficulties of maintaining sufficient dissolved oxygen, that instead of using air as the oxygen feed gas, gas with a substantially higher oxygen concentration (at least 80 vol%) was used to enhance the rate of oxygen transfer to the slurry. Thus, one

Art Unit: 1742

of ordinary skill in the art would have found the teachings of Vahldieck quite pertinent to the problem of maintaining sufficient dissolved oxygen in a higher temperature slurry.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry D. Wilkins, III whose telephone number is 571-272-1251. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Harry D Wilkins, III
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1742

hdw